



---

## **The University's Academic Regulations: 2025-26**

### **Academic Integrity Regulations 2025-26**

#### **Contents**

<b>General Overview</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>AI1</b> Introduction	<b>2</b>
<b>AI2</b> Key Principles	<b>3</b>
<b>Application Of The Regulations</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>AI3</b> Introduction and Definition	<b>6</b>
<b>AI4</b> Disciplinary procedure for suspected/alleged Academic Integrity breaches	<b>7</b>
<b>AI5</b> University Academic Integrity Panel	<b>19</b>
<b>AI6</b> Independent External Review	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix I</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Procedural Flow Charts</b>	<b>31</b>

# General Overview

## AI1 Introduction

Academic Integrity is defined as adhering to the university's academic integrity values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage, even in the face of adversity in all aspects of their study.

**AI1.1** The Academic Integrity Regulations set and maintain high standards of academic practice within the University community, to encourage individuals to accept their obligations to maintain these standards and promote the University's reputation, good name and standing.

**AI1.2** The purpose of these regulations is to ensure that all matters relating to allegations of academic integrity breaches – intended or otherwise - are managed fairly and consistently. Any allegations that do not relate to a student gaining an unfair academic advantage are considered to be conduct matters and these are addressed via the University's [Student Conduct Regulations](#).

**AI1.3** These regulations apply to all students registered with the University which includes franchise programmes and Edinburgh Napier University International College (ENUIC). Any allegations of academic integrity breaches concerning a graduate of the University will be dealt with in accordance with the [Graduate Academic Integrity Regulations](#) as approved by the Academic Board.

**AI1.4** Allegations considered in line with the Academic Integrity regulations may be made by staff, students or members of the public (who need not have been personally and/or adversely affected by the alleged breach) and should normally be received by the University in writing (via email). However, the

University will give consideration to allegations of academic integrity breaches of any nature from any source.

**AI1.5** It should be noted that where a finding of a breach of these regulations has been made it may, in certain professional settings, affect the student's fitness to practice resulting in the University being unable to certify this and may lead to the Academic Integrity Officer advising the professional body which could in turn lead to exclusion for the student from membership of requisite professional bodies. In such circumstances, the University will invoke the [Fitness to Practise Regulations](#).

**AI1.6** The principles of these regulations apply to all students irrespective of their location/mode of study. It may be necessary to vary procedure for Doctoral College students, students on placements or for students undertaking programmes delivered online or overseas.

**AI1.7** These regulations do not preclude the possibility of the University having recourse to the police and the criminal courts where necessary.

**AI1.8** References to days throughout these regulations shall mean working days (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday) except where expressly stated otherwise.

## **AI2 Key Principles**

The application of these regulations relies on the following key principles:

**AI2.1** Referrals will be addressed promptly and resolved quickly and efficiently at the level of the University appropriate to the nature of the offence. Each referral will be handled fairly and equitably with due regard to the individual circumstances.

- AI2.2** Students shall have the right to a Formal Review against the finding and/or penalty of their case.
- AI2.3** Any issues relating to pastoral care and welfare that arise while addressing an academic integrity breach will be handled with sensitivity and due regard to confidentiality. Staff engaged with disciplinary matters should be aware of the University's Data Protection Code of Practice with particular attention paid to Section 8 (Data Sharing) and Section 19 (References).
- AI2.4** Penalties imposed as a result of academic integrity issues being referred for action under the terms of these regulations will only be overridden by Extenuating Circumstances procedures in exceptional cases.
- AI2.5** A student shall be entitled to be accompanied by a person who can provide support and, where applicable, guidance to the student concerned at investigation meetings or panel hearings. That person should be a member of University staff, a member of staff from the ENSA Advice service or another student. Any 'accompanying' person or representative must not have been involved in the case under investigation.
- AI2.6** Attendees of meetings/panel hearings held will not be present without good reason. An appropriate level of attendance is no more than two members of staff plus the student concerned and the person they have chosen to accompany them, though it is noted that some referrals may require further attendees. Should additional attendees be required, there will be consideration regarding whether attendance at the meeting could be scheduled at intervals.

- AI2.7** Audio/video recording of meetings/panel hearings associated with these regulations will generally not be permitted. Requests of this nature will be considered where required as a reasonable adjustment pending consideration of an appropriate disability assessment. Regarding requests related to recording, any decision taken will involve input from the Disability Inclusion team and/or the Information Governance team where appropriate. Covert recording and any unauthorised sharing or distribution of recordings may be considered misconduct matters in their own right.
- AI2.8** Investigation records will normally be made available to all relevant parties involved in the meetings/panel hearings, though records provided are presented in summary form.
- AI2.9** All referrals received will be treated confidentially. Each will be investigated informally in the first instance to establish whether a formal investigation is required.
- AI2.10** All records documenting the conduct and findings of proceedings concerning individual students will be retained until the last action on the case, plus six years, has elapsed.
- AI2.11** Where action within these regulations is required by a senior member of staff, such as a member of the University Leadership Team, a nominee may act on their behalf should the incumbent post holder be unavailable or elect to delegate responsibility.

- AI2.12** Judgements by individuals and panels in relation to any matter considered in line with these regulations will be made on the basis of the balance of probabilities i.e. whether or not their opinion is that what is alleged is more likely to have occurred than not to have occurred. There is no requirement to adhere to the criminal court standard of proven beyond any reasonable doubt.
- AI2.13** Careful consideration will be given to informing all those impacted by any matter considered in line with these regulations, of the final outcome. Our duty of care to all parties will be taken into account as it is determined who we advise of an outcome and how much detail we disclose to them.

## **Application of the Regulations**

### **AI3 Introduction and Definition**

#### **AI3.1 Definition of a breach**

A breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations (see section AI4.2) by a student will be considered if it is identified or alleged that the following to have occurred:

- An act which, intended or otherwise, offers the potential for any student to gain an unfair advantage in any assessment.
- The inclusion of content by a student in their assessment submission which is inappropriately referenced, not referenced at all or not thought to be their own work.
- In the case of Doctoral College students, an act which, intended or otherwise, is not in adherence with the University Code of Research Practice.
- In the case Doctoral College students, this may pertain to any work produced in the course of the degree, including externally published work, work presented at conference or work submitted for internal review, as well as the behaviour of the student in relation to that work.

### **AI3.2 Categories of breaches of the Academic Integrity Regulations**

Breaches of the Academic Integrity Regulations will be taken to include acts of plagiarism (including self-plagiarism), cheating, collusion, falsification or fabrication of data, personation or bribery, use of essay mills and/or ghost writers, inappropriate use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) content generation or writing assistance tools, all as defined in [Appendix I](#).

## **AI4 Disciplinary procedure for suspected/alleged Academic Integrity breaches**

### **AI4.1 Responsible Officers**

AI4.1.1 Each School shall designate a Senior Academic Integrity Officer to co-ordinate the work of School AIO's and to provide leadership within their School on academic matters.

AI4.1.2 Each School shall designate an appropriate member(s) of staff to have responsibility for investigating allegations of breaches of the Academic Integrity Regulations. This person is referred to below as an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO).

AI4.1.3 In any allegation in which an AIO is directly involved, either as module leader, marker or programme leader, another appropriate AIO from the School will carry out the role.

AI4.1.4 An AIO shall investigate allegations relating to students taking modules provided by the School or on a programme registered to the

School, as appropriate.

- AI4.1.5 Where an incident of an alleged breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations arises, the School in which that relevant module is delivered shall be responsible for applying these regulations in the first instance. Should a number of incidents occur during a student's programme of study, responsibility for applying these regulations will normally be transferred to the School in which the student is registered. This School will also be responsible for notifying any other School in which the student is enrolled on a module if it is relevant to the case. Retrospective removal of credits can occur if a breach in academic integrity is identified in work for which credits have already been earned.
- AI4.1.6 Edinburgh Napier University International College (ENUIC) staff will be responsible for applying these regulations in the first instance. At the point of an ENUIC student transferring to an undergraduate ENU programme, any previous penalties applied to an ENUIC student will be transferred with the student to their new ENU programme. This does not apply to ENUIC students enrolled in a pre-master's course or a foundation course in nursing.
- AI4.1.7 In situations as detailed in AI4.1.4, the investigating AIO should make contact with the AIO from the student's School and/or the student's Programme Team or Personal Development Tutor and inform them of any investigation taking place and the outcome on completion.



## **AI4.2 Breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations**

AI4.2.1 Three categories of breach are recognised:

AI4.2.1.1 **Negligence**, i.e. a minor incident, usually the first, which has occurred through carelessness or inexperience and can be attributed to the student's poor understanding of referencing or academic practice.

AI4.2.1.2 **Malpractice**, i.e. an incident which is deemed to be more serious than negligence and one in which the student should have known that the behaviour was unacceptable, this would include but is not limited to an incident in the later stages of a programme or a repeat incident; and where it is concluded that the student has gained an unfair advantage in an assessment or examination.

AI4.2.1.3 **Misconduct**, i.e. an incident whereby there is an attempt to gain advantage by behaviour which it is difficult not to see as intentional, this would include but is not limited to copying or stealing work from another student, plagiarism, contract cheating, repeated incidents, fabrication of data or professional records, cheating in an exam.

Further definitions of what constitutes an academic integrity breach can be found in Appendix 1.

AI4.2.2 In assessing the level of any breach of Academic Integrity Regulations, penalties available to an AIO are defined in section AI4.3.2. It is likely that negligence will attract a lower penalty than

malpractice which will attract a lower penalty than misconduct.

AI4.2.3 Provided a student has had due opportunity to reflect upon and learn from any initial warning penalty issued (what qualifies as due opportunity is at the discretion of the AIO), any previous breach of Academic Integrity Regulations recorded against the student is likely to lead to a subsequent incident being regarded as malpractice or misconduct, as appropriate, even if the subsequent incident might otherwise have been deemed of a lower category.

AI4.2.4 During an investigation into an incident, an AIO should check with the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity whether previous findings (if any) for a student from out with the School can inform the investigation. Any previous finding may have a bearing on the category of breach and any penalty applied.

### **AI4.3 Penalties available to Academic Integrity Officers for breaches of the Academic Integrity Regulations**

AI4.3.1 In the following list of penalties, standard University re-assessment regulations are assumed to apply unless otherwise indicated. Where a component of assessment (normally coursework) is made up of several elements, the penalties indicated here only apply to the element in which the breach of Academic Integrity Regulations occurred, unless otherwise indicated.

AI4.3.2 Details of the formal penalties and decisions available to an AIO follow. AIOs should use their discretion as to which penalty is applied and also refer to guidance as provided via the Officer responsible for

administering academic integrity and the Academic Integrity Oversight Committee (AIOC).

**Application of penalties must take account of any relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) requirement for the programme of study.**

- i) Initial warning Penalty; only applicable as a standalone penalty where this is the first recorded academic breach by a student. (No mark reduction and breach recorded as negligence).
- ii) Mark reduction of the assessment to be determined by the AIO (See AIO guidance notes for information about recommended mark reductions). This penalty may result in a fail being recorded for the assessment and re-assess at the next opportunity (if applicable).
- iii) Fail element of assessment (0%) and re-assess at next opportunity (if appropriate).
- iv) Fail assessment with no reassessment offered. AIOs should discuss with a school Senior Academic Integrity Officer before applying this penalty.
- v) Fail assessment (0%) and referral to the University Academic Integrity Panel or, where applicable, Fitness to Practise Convenor, unless the offence is particularly serious, this penalty should not be used until at least the third instance of an academic integrity case for a student. AIOs should also consider whether there has been adequate time in between cases for students to digest warnings i.e., suspected similar academic integrity breaches in two or more assessments handed in around the same time should only be classed as one episode of a breach although the student may have received more than one penalty. A breach in any of the following

trimesters will likely result in referral to a UAIP if this equates to three or more breaches.

- AI4.3.3 An AIO should use a penalty consistent with the category of breach (see Section AI4.2.1), the perceived gravity of the incident and the potential consequences for the student (see Section AI4.5.2). The AIO is required to inform other relevant School administrators as appropriate.

If any penalty results in a fail, please refer to the University's General Academic Regulations A11.8 e) iv) regarding compensatory pass for further information.

Category of Breach	Penalties Available
Negligence (see AI4.2.1.1)	All those listed in AI4.3.2
Malpractice (see AI4.2.1.2)	A <i>minimum</i> penalty of AI4.3.2 ii)
Misconduct (see AI4.2.1.3)	A <i>minimum</i> penalty of AI4.3.2 iii)

- AI4.3.4 All students issued a penalty should be instructed by the AIO to participate in an online Academic Integrity Tutorial (AIT) provided by the University's Academic Skills team who will record their attendance. Students are then required to forward confirmation of attendance to the relevant AIO and/or school academic integrity mailbox. Failure by the student, without good reason, to participate in a session within six weeks of their penalty may result in another penalty being applied by the AIO or an escalated penalty being applied for any future offence.

- AI4.3.5 A penalty may lead to a student being unable to continue with their current programme, e.g., a penalty which leads to a fail in a compulsory module. In such cases, the AIO will advise the student to seek academic guidance from their Programme Leader or Personal Development Tutor.
- AI4.3.6 The AIO should inform the Officer responsible for managing academic integrity where penalty v) is applied.
- AI4.3.8 As stated in regulation A.11.8e) iv of the University's Academic Regulations, a student will not be considered for an award of a compensatory pass in a module if a formal penalty for a breach of Academic Integrity Regulations has been recorded in the module. In such situations, the AIO should inform the Chair and/or Clerk of the relevant Programme Assessment Board or an appropriate senior administrator who will inform the Chair and/or Clerk.
- AI4.3.9 Referrals of alleged academic integrity breaches by School of Health and Social Care students, may be referred for investigation under the [Fitness to Practise Regulations](#).

#### **AI4.4 Investigating alleged breaches of the Academic Integrity Regulations**

##### **AI4.4.1 Examinations**

- AI4.4.1.1 Where Academic Integrity issues are suspected in an examination the Invigilator will endorse the student's script book at the appropriate point with the time and a note of the alleged behaviour and inform the student that the allegation will be reported. The student will be permitted to continue the examination, having been

given fresh script book(s).

AI4.4.1.2 At the conclusion of the examination the Invigilator will complete a report and submit it with the student's examination script book(s) to the appropriate member of the exams administration team.

AI4.4.1.3 The completed report and the script will be forwarded by a senior member of the exams administration team to the AIO for that School who will conduct an investigation in accordance with Section AI4.5 below.

AI4.4.1.4 Where an allegation of Academic Integrity is made after an examination has taken place, this must be passed to the relevant AIO for the School in which the module is registered. The AIO for that School will conduct an investigation in accordance with Section AI4.5 below.

#### **AI4.4.2 Continuous assessment**

AI4.4.2.1 All teaching staff are asked to refer any suspicions of academic integrity breaches to their School's AIOs at the earliest possible opportunity. Ideally, and always where possible, this should be well in advance of the meeting of the Programme Assessment Board that will consider the module results.

AI4.4.2.2 If after such suspicion is confirmed, the member of staff should pass the following documentation to the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) for the School in which the module is registered:

- i) Assessment brief or any other relevant information e.g.

marking rubric.

- ii) A brief resume of the case outlining the grounds for suspicion;
- iii) Copies of the submitted piece(s) of work;
- iv) Any appropriate evidence.

#### **AI4.4.3 Doctoral College Students**

AI4.4.3.1 All Doctoral College students are required to adhere to the University Code of Practice on Research Integrity.

AI4.4.3.2 Where a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations or the University Code of Practice on Research Integrity is suspected, the person noting the suspected breach should discuss the evidence with the Head of the Doctoral College

AI4.4.3.3 All referrals will be reported to the Doctoral College Examination Board. At the discretion of the Board, cases may be subsequently submitted to a University Academic Integrity Panel.

AI4.3.4.4 A University Academic Integrity Panel investigating a Doctoral College student should always be attended by someone from the Doctoral College Examination Board, to advise the panel as necessary on research degree policy and regulations.

#### **AI4.5 Investigation by an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) – Process**

The AIO will normally review within five working days all the information available and conclude whether or not there is a valid case to answer. Where

possible this decision will be made before marks are due to be returned to students.

AI4.5.1 If there is no valid case to answer, the matter will not proceed further and any material pertaining to the allegations will be destroyed.

AI4.5.2 If the AIO decides that there is a valid case to answer, the AIO will inform the student that an investigation is being carried out. (In cases where a School elects to consider a referral via a School AIO panel, students will be given five working days to submit any comments or evidence they wish the panel to consider.) Based on the outcome of the investigation, the AIO may rule that the matter:

- i) Does not constitute a breach of Academic Integrity Regulations;
- ii) Constitutes a breach of Academic Integrity Regulations and will determine an appropriate penalty under Section AI4.3.2;

AI4.5.3 A student will be given five working days' notice of any meeting to investigate an allegation. The student will only be offered another date if they contact the AIO in advance, providing details of their reason for making a request for an alternative arrangement. The AIO has discretion to give the student a further five working days' notice of a meeting if they accept the student's rationale. Failure of a student to attend a scheduled meeting/School AIO Panel will result in the meeting taking place and a decision will be made in the absence of the student.

AI4.5.4 Notice will be given to a student under investigation in writing (via e-mail) to the appropriate Edinburgh Napier University account, and it



will be assumed that such notification will have been received by the student as students are expected to regularly check this email address in line with the expectations set out in the Student Charter. Where students are studying with a collaborative partner, the partner administrator will be informed. If the student cannot attend, submissions to the meeting may be made in writing.

## **AI4.6 Outcome of Investigation**

- AI4.6.1 The AIO will notify the student in writing (via email) of the outcome of the investigation and any penalty imposed as soon as reasonably practicable, but no later than five working days after the meeting to investigate the allegation. Communication will be made via Edinburgh Napier University email address unless otherwise requested by the student.
- AI4.6.2 Where a breach has been confirmed and a penalty imposed the student will be advised of the right to a Formal Review see Section AI4.7.
- AI4.6.3 In all cases where a finding has been made under AI4.5.2 ii), details of the breach, the meeting and the outcome will be retained by the School in accordance with Section AI2.11.
- AI4.6.4 Details of any penalties imposed shall be enacted in accordance with Section AI4.3.

## **AI4.7 Formal Review of Academic Integrity Penalty**

- AI4.7.1 A student may request a Formal Review of the outcome, in writing

(via email), to the appropriate Academic Integrity School email inbox for processing. A Formal Review will be completed by a Senior Academic Integrity Officer (or nominee) from another School who has no prior knowledge of the case.

AI4.7.2 The Formal Review must be submitted within five working days of the date the student received confirmation of the penalty.

AI4.7.3 A request for a Formal Review must be made based on one of the following grounds:

- i) There was a procedural irregularity in the process undertaken by the AIO which materially influenced the final decision.
- ii) New evidence is now available which might have caused the AIO to reach a different conclusion but could not have been made available at the time of the investigation. In such cases an explanation/ evidence as to why the material could not have been made available during the investigation should be provided.

AI4.7.4 The possible outcome of the Formal Review are

- i) Formal Review upheld may review or set aside the penalty imposed
- ii) Formal Review not upheld

AI4.7.5 The Senior Academic Integrity Officer (or nominee) should consult the AIO who made the original decision before finalising their decision.

AI4.7.6 The Senior Academic Integrity Officer (or nominee) will be responsible for ensuring their decision is communicated to the student and any relevant academic and administrative staff, as soon as reasonably practicable and no later than fifteen working days after the receipt of the Formal Review.

AI4.7.7 If a student remains dissatisfied following the communication referenced in section AI4.7.4 above, information on external appeals can be found in section [AI6](#).

## **AI5 University Academic Integrity Panel**

### **AI5.1 Referral**

AI5.1.1 An AIO having considered the details of the investigation may, due to the seriousness of the breach or the student has received at least three previous integrity breaches, refer the case to the University Academic Integrity Panel under AI4.5.2 ii). The AIO will advise the student of such a referral.

AI5.1.2 To make a referral, the AIO should contact the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity and request a UAIP referral form. Completion of this form allows the AIO to clearly present the case, the rationale for referral and suggest what the School's view of an appropriate outcome is.

AI5.1.3 The Officer responsible for administering academic integrity will present the referral to an academic member of University Leadership

Team (normally the Vice Principal of Learning & Teaching or nominee) who will advise whether the referral is accepted or not.

AI5.1.4 If the referral is not accepted, the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity will let the referring AIO know and will provide feedback from the University Leadership Team member with regard to the options on the action they have been recommended to take in lieu of a UAIP.

AI5.1.5 If the referral is accepted, the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity will organise a University Academic Integrity Panel.

AI5.1.6 The University Academic Integrity Panel will hear the allegation as soon as reasonably practicable.

## **AI5.2 Constitution of University Academic Integrity Panel**

AI5.2.1 The University Academic Integrity Panel will comprise the Vice Principal (Learning & Teaching) or their nominee as Convenor; one Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) and one student member (or elected student sabbatical officer) nominated by the ENSA President. The Convenor may elect to co-opt one subject specialist member of academic staff nominated by the relevant Dean of School if appropriate. None of the Panel should come from the same School as the student against whom the allegations have been made and had no direct or previous involvement with the student concerned

AI5.2.2 A panel involving a Doctoral College student should always be

attended by someone from the Academic Committee of the Doctoral College, to advise the panel as necessary on research degree policy and regulations.

- AI5.2.3 The Officer responsible for administering academic integrity or their nominee shall act as clerk and keep a record of proceedings.

### **AI5.3 University Academic Integrity Panel Hearing**

- AI5.3.1 The student will be notified in writing (via email) of the University Academic Integrity Panel Hearing no less than ten working days in advance and shall be entitled to attend the Hearing, accompanied as defined in Section AI2.5.
- AI5.3.2 The student will be provided with the basis for the allegation and, where appropriate, copies of any documentary evidence no less than five working days ahead of the Hearing. The student will be invited to comment on this evidence. If the student refutes the allegation, they will be invited to present further evidence in support of this. In exceptional circumstances, if it is apparent this timescale is not possible, this will be communicated to the student and the reasons for any delay will be detailed.
- AI5.3.3 The student may call witnesses on their behalf and submit relevant documentary evidence provided the intention to do so is notified to the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity or their nominee at least 48 hours in advance of the Hearing.
- AI5.3.4 The Panel will receive and consider documentary evidence (Referral

Form) of the current investigation (including any evidence) and for context any information about previous AIO referrals for the student.

AI5.3.5 The student shall have the opportunity to put any relevant extenuating circumstances to the Panel although its primary focus shall be on establishing whether or not there were academic integrity issues.

AI5.3.6 Failure by the student to attend at the time specified, except for a written reason acceptable to the Convenor of the University Academic Integrity Panel, will not preclude the Panel from considering the allegation and reaching a decision.

#### **AI5.4 Penalties imposed by a University Academic Integrity Panel**

AI5.4.1 When considering which penalty to apply, the University Academic Integrity Panel should consider the student's academic integrity history and can review all the students' assessments (those that have breached the AI regulations as well as those that have not) if deemed necessary/appropriate to support decision-making.

The formal penalties available to the University Academic Integrity Panel are penalties iii) and iv) which are available to the AIO in section AI4.3.2 above and the following:

- i) Fail the programme with retained credit and eligible for an exit award.

The student will be exited from their programme and may be issued with a lesser award (if eligible) than their original intended award (for example a PG Diploma could be issued for a student on a Master's programme). They may therefore be

eligible to attend a graduation ceremony. The student will not be permitted to reapply to the University for one full academic year after the current academic year of study.

- ii) Fail the programme with removal of credit and no exit award.

The student will be withdrawn from their programme with no qualification awarded and will be issued with a certificate of credit. The student will be permanently excluded from the university and not permitted to return for future study. They will therefore not be eligible to attend a graduation ceremony.

AI5.4.2 A penalty may lead to a student being unable to continue with their current programme or not get their intended award, e.g., a penalty which leads to a fail in a compulsory module. In such a case, the University Academic Integrity Panel will advise the student to seek academic guidance from their Programme Leader or Personal Development Tutor.

AI5.4.3 Penalties under- section AI5.4.1 will be recorded by the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity.

AI5.4.4 The University Academic Integrity Panel should use the lowest penalty consistent with the category of breach (see Section AI4.3.3), the perceived gravity of the incident and the potential consequences for the student.

## **AI5.5 Outcome**

AI5.5.1 At the conclusion of the Hearing the University Academic Integrity Panel will reach one of two outcomes as detailed below:

- i) The allegation is not upheld and no further action will be taken.
- ii) The allegation is upheld and a penalty will be imposed as outlined in Section AI5.4.1.

AI5.5.2 Details of the alleged breach of Academic Integrity Regulations, the Hearing and the outcome, including any penalties imposed under Section AI4.3.2 i) – v), will be retained in accordance with Section AI2.11 above.

AI5.5.3 The outcome will be notified to the student as soon as reasonably practicable but no later than five working days after the Hearing and will outline the right of Formal Review as defined in Section AI5.6. Communication will be made via Edinburgh Napier University email address will be used unless otherwise requested by the student.

AI5.5.4 The Officer responsible for administering academic integrity will refer the panel outcome to the convenor of the Programme Assessment Board via the senior school administrator in lieu of any updates required to the student's record.

## **AI5.6 Request for a Formal Review against the decision of a University Academic Integrity Panel (UAIP)**

AI5.6.1 A student may request a Formal Review, writing (via email), to the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity against any finding made by a UAIP in relation to an alleged breach of these regulations. The Officer responsible for administering academic integrity will arrange for a member of Senior Leadership Team or



their nominee who has not had prior involvement with the case to consider the request. The Formal Review must be submitted within ten working days of the date the UAIP's decision was sent to the student.

AI5.6.2 A Formal Review is not a re-hearing of the original case and may only be made on one of the following grounds:

- i) There was a procedural irregularity in the conduct of the investigation and/or conduct of any Hearings which materially influenced the outcome; or
- ii) New evidence is now available which might have caused the University Academic Integrity Panel to reach a different conclusion but could not have been made available at the time of the Hearing. In such cases an explanation / evidence as to why the material could not have been made available for the Panel should be provided.

AI5.6.3 SLT or nominee will consider the evidence submitted and provide a written (via Email) response outlining the outcome of the formal review. The possible outcomes are:

- i) Formal Review upheld – may review or set aside the penalty imposed
- ii) Formal Review not upheld

The final decision must be communicated to the student and the Officer responsible for administering academic integrity.

AI5.6.4 The person considering the Formal Review will notify the outcome to the student in writing (via email) as soon as reasonably practicable

and no later than fifteen working days after receipt of the Formal Review request. This notification will include confirmation that the student has now reached completion of the University's procedures with regard to the matter.

- AI5.6.5 The decision of the person who heard the appeal will be final in all cases except where the appeal is against the decision to exclude the student in which case the Vice Principal of Learning & Teaching or nominee must confirm the decision or otherwise.
- AI5.6.6 If a student remains dissatisfied following the communication referenced in section AI5.6.3 above, information on external reviews can be found in section [AI6](#).

## **AI6 Independent External Review**

### **AI6.1 Information about the SPSO**

The Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) is the final stage for complaints about public services in Scotland. This includes any dissatisfaction following the completion of a university's internal procedures. If you remain dissatisfied with a university or co-operative after fully engaging with an internal procedure, you can ask the SPSO to look into the matter.

The SPSO cannot normally look at matters:

- where you have not fully exhausted the university's specific procedure to deal with the matter, or
- that have been or are being considered in a court of law.

The SPSO's contact details are:

**Office Address:** SPSO Bridgeside House, 99 McDonald Road Edinburgh, EH7 4NS (please make an appointment in advance)

**Freepost** Freepost SPSO

**Freephone** 0800 377 7330

**Online contact** [www.spsso.org.uk/contact-us](http://www.spsso.org.uk/contact-us)

**Website** [www.spsso.org.uk/contact us](http://www.spsso.org.uk/contact-us)

**Mobile site** <http://m.spsso.org.uk>

This document has been reformatted to make it more accessible. Should you have any feedback, please email [quality@napier.ac.uk](mailto:quality@napier.ac.uk)

## Appendix I

Academic Integrity breaches are defined as follows:

1. **Plagiarism:** Unacknowledged incorporation in a student's work in any assessment of material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another. Plagiarism may therefore include:
  - i) The use of another person's material without reference or acknowledgement;
  - ii) The summarising of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation without acknowledgement, such as cutting and pasting from published sources.
  - iii) The use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source;
  - iv) Copying of the work of another student with or without that student's knowledge or agreement;
  - v) Use of commissioned material presented as the student's own. This refers to material purchased from an individual or organisation (often referred to as "Essay Mills") used to form all or part of an assessment submission. This also includes the use of work obtained from an individual or organisation (often referred to as "essay assistance" websites) by means of a student uploading their own work (or that of a fellow student or material from their course) in exchange for material later used in another module or subject area.
2. **Self-Plagiarism:** The use or re-use of a student's own work (material), the work having previously been awarded credit. This includes the act of copying (or duplicating) from any previously submitted written work which has been marked and recorded, which is re-submitted without due reference or citation and is presented as original work.

3. **Cheating:** a student will be deemed to be cheating as a result of any of the following:

- i) Deliberately acquiring advanced knowledge of the detailed content of an assessment or obtaining a copy of an “unseen” written assessment paper in advance of the date and time for its authorised release;
- ii) Communicating with or copying from another candidate during an examination;
- iii) Permitting another candidate to copy from their assessment;
- iv) Possession of any printed, written or electronic material or unauthorised material during an examination which may contain information relevant to the subjects of the examination;
- v) Communicating during an examination with any person other than a properly authorised invigilator or another authorised member of staff;
- vi) Impersonating another student or permitting himself/herself to be impersonated.
- vii) Undertaking any other action with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage over other students.
- viii) Being found to have inappropriately used Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) content generation or writing assistance tools e.g. a paraphrasing tool or website – e.g. ChatGPT Quilbot- to gain an undue advantage in an assessment. The extent to which any advantage has been gained will be determined at the Academic Integrity Officer’s discretion.

4. **Collusion:** collusion may exist where a student:

- i) is in complicity with another student in the completion of work which

is intended to be submitted as either that student's or the other student's own work;

- ii) knowingly permits another student to copy all or part of his/her own work and to submit it as that student's own work.

5. **Falsification or fabrication of data:** the presentation of data in reports, projects and records, such as records of attendance or of competencies achieved, which is based on evidence which is fictitious, falsely presented as having been carried out by the student, or has been obtained by unfair means.
6. **Personation:** the assumption of one student of the identity of another person with the intent to deceive or gain unfair advantage.
7. **Bribery:** the paying, offering or attempted exchange of an inducement for information or material intended to advantage the recipient in an assessment.

## Procedural Flow Charts



